

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/815,396 | 03/31/2004 | Christopher J. Lord | 110466-152116 | 7579 | |
| 31817 SCHWARE V | 7590 04/30/201 VILLIAMSON & WY A | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 | | | ZHANG, SHIRLEY X | | |
| 1211 S.W. FIF PORTLAND, | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| , | | | 2444 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 04/30/2010 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/815,396 | LORD ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| SHIRLEY X. ZHANG | 2444 | | |

| | SHIRLEY X. ZHANG | 2444 | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will be statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of a valued or 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMELINE OF Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of the property of | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | E below); | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or | ter form for appear by materially rec | ideing of antipinying ti | 10 133003 101 | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mpliant Amendment (f | PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | , | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | t canceling the | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | be entered and an ex | planation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,8,9,11,23 and 25-31. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | I sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | itry is below or attache | ed. | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowand | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement(s)</i> . (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| AMBIEGO C. Moureley In C | | | | | | | |
| /William C. Vaughn, Jr./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444 | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued on page 9 of "Remarks" that Examiner stated in the Final Rejection that Maher did not explicitly disclose wherein the second device uses an address that is globally orutable. "Examiner responds that Applicant's remark is based on incorrect understanding of Examiner's statement in the Final Rejection.

Examiner's statement as a whole is recited below

"Maher did not explicitly disclose

determining by the intermediary gateway, whether network traffic from the second device is corresponding to a previous secure communication session established when the second device uses an address that is globally routable on the internal network, wherein the second device uses an address that is globally routable on the internal and the external networks and therefore said network traffic is valid with respect to the internal network; and

responding by the intermediary gateway, to said network traffic with an error and forcing the second device to re-establish a secure communication session from the external network."

Examiner's position was that Maher did not explicitly disclosed a combination of all the claim elements cited above, with "wherein the second device uses an address that is globally routable" being one of the plurality of elements. Therefore, Applicant's interpretation of Examiner's statement is incorrect and Applicant's argument based on such incorrect interpretation is unpersuasive.

Examiner's Note: claim 27 was amended to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection and therefore is entered for consideration.